

*m*

A SECOND *4*  
LETTER

*R. C.* TO THE *Karlshorne*

AUTHOR of a Book,

*Hoadley*  
ENTITLED, *8*

*A Plain Account of the Nature  
and End of the Sacrament of the  
LORD'S-SUPPER.*

CONTAINING

Further REMARKS on the said Book,  
occasion'd by what has been writ-  
ten in its DEFENCE.

---

By the AUTHOR of the REMARKS.

*Richard Briscoe*

---

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. ROBERTS, near the Oxford-  
Arms in Warwick-Lane. M DCC XXXV.

Price One Shilling.

LETTER

TO THE  
AUTHOR OF A BOOK  
ENTITLED  
A FINE ACCOUNT OF THE  
AND PART OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE  
LORDS SUPERIOR

CONTAINING  
FURTHER REASONING ON THE  
OCCASION OF WHICH THE  
TWO IN KENT



Printed at the  
Printed by  
Printed by





A Second LETTER to the Author  
of a Book, entituled, *A Plain  
Account of the Nature and End of  
the Sacrament of the LORD'S  
SUPPER.*

S I R,

**I** AM persuaded you are so much  
the Friend of Liberty, that I can  
need no Apology for speaking  
my Mind freely, concerning your  
late Work. You have indeed  
fairly invited me to it, *Preface,*  
p. 7. where you say, *that it will  
be a Satisfaction to you, to be set right in any Point  
small or great, in which you have judged amiss.* I  
have not the Vanity to presume to be the Person  
who is able to *set you right*; but I think these  
Words of yours are a sufficient Encouragement to  
any one who upon a deliberate reading your  
Book, is convinced that you *have judged amiss*, to  
lay before you the Reasons of this his Conviction.

I have already express'd my Apprehensions, that your Book is wrote in such a manner, as may lead People into dangerous Mistakes concerning both the Qualifications of a worthy Receiver, and the Preparation that is at all times fitting, and in many Cases necessary, towards a worthy Receiving. I am sorry to see such full Proof of this, so soon publish'd to the World by your own Admirers and Advocates. I should have thought they might have waited with a little Patience, to see whether you would not more determinately fix your Meaning, before they had adopted the very worst Sense of your Work; but since they have been so hasty, ought it not to be an Argument with you, if you disallow their Interpretation, to make the World speedily and fully apprized of it?

An anonymous Writer in the *Independent London Journal* has undertaken your Defence against the Remarks with no little Warmth, and seems inspired to the Work by the profound Veneration he entertains for your Person and Performance. These are his Words, "The reputed Author of the Plain Account, is as I have said before, one of the exactest Reasoners of this or any other Age. He needs no Help, nor ought any Man to dictate either Sentiment or Style to him. And 'tis as impertinent to quote other Writers upon him as it would be to object the Sentiments or Style of any one of the Classics to the rest, when they are all of them Originals in their kind." The greater the Esteem this Gentleman has of your Abilities and Work, the more deeply will every thing which he imagines you lay down as your Opinion, be impressed on his Mind; and if he mistakes your Meaning,

ing, the Error will be too fast riveted for any to disengage him from it but yourself.

That he has understood you in the worst Sense with regard to the two forementioned Points, I shall shew you from his own Words, *N. 5. p. 1. col. 1. fin. 2. pr.* “The Remarker is displeased that “the *profane and habitual Sinner* is by the *Plain Account*, admitted to come to this Ordinance.” And a little further, in the same Column, “’Tis “astonishing the Remarker should be so tedious on this Head, without saying one Word “in Defence of the *Corinthians*, who so monstrously abused the Design of this Ordinance, “that they even got drunk at it, without either shewing they were guilty of no Crime; “or else what there was peculiar in their Circumstances, that induced *St. Paul* not to reject them, when he *design’d the Rule immediately added*, should be a standing one in the “Christian Church, to reject others less wicked. “On this Passage it is the Author founds his “Observation, that habitual Sinners were not “rejected in the Apostolick Times from this “Ordinance, any more than any other Ordinance of Religion.—To admit *the vilest of Mankind* to come to it is no Profanation, unless *St. Paul* profan’d it in the Instance of the “*Drunken Corinthians* above.” Although there is something very obscure in this Passage concerning *St. Paul’s designing the Rule immediately added*, *1 Cor. xi.* yet are there two things sufficiently plain and express. First, that it is your Observation, that habitual Sinners were not rejected in the Apostolick Times from this Ordinance, any more than from any other Ordinance of Religion. That he means hereby that it’s your Opinion, they were admitted to partake

p. 17.

14

15.

of this as well as other Ordinances, is evident from the whole Passage; more fully so from the last Words, "To admit the vilest of Mankind to come to it, is no Profanation, unless St. Paul profan'd it in the Instance of the drunken *Corinthians*." 2dly, That you found this Observation on St. Paul's Words, 1 Cor. xi. I am fully persuaded you are much better acquainted with St. Paul's Writings than to entertain the Opinion which is here imputed to you, that *habitual Sinners*, that *Drunkards*, and therefore the vilest of Mankind, were in the apostolick Times admitted to the Sacrament; and so might he, had he perus'd the Book he undertakes to answer with any tolerable Care. For although he roundly asserts, N. 4. p. 1. col. 3.

8. "That the Author of the Remarks has not produced one single Passage of Scripture, either in Answer to any Part of the plain Account, or in Defence of any thing he himself has advanced;" yet had I expressly quoted \* 1 Cor. v. to prove that some habitual Sinners at least, whose Sins were publick and notorious, were rejected from the Communion by St. Paul. And that it may not be overlook'd a second time, I'll transcribe the Words; they are in the eleventh Verse of that Chapter, *But now I have written unto you not to keep Company: If any Man that is called a Brother be a Fornicator or Covetous, or an Idolater, or a Railer, or a Drunkard, or an Extortioner, with such an one no not to eat.* Can any thing be more evident, than that St. Paul did not admit Drunkards to come to the holy Sacrament, or any of those habitual Sinners mention'd in the foregoing List? Notwithstanding, Sir, he has fix'd the Opinion upon you, that St. Paul



Paul did admit them ; and he says you found it upon 1 Cor. xi. Is it possible then, that you shou'd make St. Paul contradict himself so grossly in one and the same Epistle? The Passage which I suppose he refers to is p. 84. of the *plain Account*. “ The *Corinthian* Sinners, whose Guilt lay in “ their unchristian Behaviour at this very Rite, “ were not forbid to come, or at all discourag'd “ by St. Paul from coming to it again, On the “ contrary, it was suppos'd still to be their Du- “ ty ; and they were required to come to it in a “ serious and christian manner ; but without the “ least Encouragement to them from hence to “ hope for God's Favour without their Amend- “ ment.” I frankly own to you I did not understand this Passage when I wrote the *Remarks*, which was the true Reason I took no notice of it. Your *Defender* plainly understands it thus, That Drunkards and other habitual Sinners, even the vilest of Mankind, were not forbid to come, or at all discourag'd by St. Paul from coming to the holy Sacrament, even while they continued in their Sins ; on the contrary, that it was supposed still to be their Duty although they went on in their vicious Courses. Than which nothing can be more false. What, not discouraged by St. Paul from coming, when they were expressly told by him that *they were guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord ; that they eat and drank Damnation to themselves ; that the Judgments of God were already in part executed upon them ; that for this cause many among them were weak and sickly, and many dead !* What can be called Discouragement if this be not ? Was not the laying so plainly before them these dreadful *Consequences* of their coming, a sufficient Prohibition to them not to come till they had actually amended? But it was sup-  
posed

*posed still to be their Duty.* What! before they had actually amended? Where is there any the least hint of such a thing? What! was it their duty to be guilty of *the Body and Blood of the Lord? To eat and drink Damnation to themselves?* And bring down the Judgments of Heaven upon their Heads? Can it be thought that St. Paul required them to come for such Ends as these? No, most certainly. The Directions he gives them are of a just contrary Tendency. He orders them to rectify what was amiss, and to examine themselves, or, as you properly observe, the Word signifies *to approve themselves after Trial and Examination*, i. e. so to enquire into their own Temper and Conduct, as to be well satisfied that they had actually amended what was wrong. To which he immediately adds the great Danger of their doing otherwise, i. e. of their coming to the Sacrament before they had so repented, as to be able to approve themselves to their own Consciences; and concludes his Directions with this express Caution, *that ye come not together unto Condemnation*; as much as to say, “If ye follow not these my Directions, but “come together before you have truly repented “and amended, the Judgments of God will still “lie upon you.” For my part, I think these things amount fully to a Command to them, to stay away till they could be satisfied in their own Consciences of their real Amendment.

Give me leave now, Sir, to examine more particularly your own Words, and try if a better Sense can be put on them than that given by your *Defender*. And in the first place, I must freely own, that I cannot possibly make the Sentence consistent with itself. You say, “the Guilt of “these Persons lay in their unchristian Behavi- “our at this very Rite; that notwithstanding, “they

“they were required to come to it in a serious  
 “and christian manner, but without the least  
 “Encouragement to them from hence (*i. e.* from  
 “their partaking of it in a serious and christian  
 “manner) to hope for God’s Favour without  
 “their Amendment.” Cou’d these Persons then,  
 whose Guilt lay in their unchristian Behaviour *at*  
 this Rite, partake of this Rite in a serious and  
 christian manner, and yet not amend their un-  
 christian Behaviour *at* this Rite? This wants an  
*Oedipus.*

The plain Truth is, in the second Place, that  
 their Guilt was not confined to their Behaviour  
*at* this very Rite. There are two Crimes prin-  
 cipally which *St. Paul* here charges them with.  
 The first, and which I take to have been far  
 the greatest, were their Divisions. To cure  
 which seems to be the chief End of his writing  
 this Epistle to them. It’s impossible in the na-  
 ture of the thing that this Sin of theirs could be  
 confin’d to the very time of their receiving, and  
 it plainly enough appears from other Parts of  
 the Epistle, that it was not. When therefore  
*Sr. Paul* says in this Chapter *you come together not*  
*for the better but for the worse: For first of all when*  
*ye come together I hear that there be Divisions among*  
*you \**; he says this, not in the least to hint that

B their

\* *1 Cor. xi. 18.* It’s very remarkable that the *Plain Ac-*  
*count* leaves this Verse unexplain’d, although there’s the strict-  
 est Connection between this and Verse 20. *When ye come to-*  
*gether THEREFORE into one Place, this is not to eat the Lord’s*  
*Supper.* Those of you who are guilty of the Schisms or Di-  
 visions I have just now mentioned, whatever Profession they  
 make of coming together to celebrate the Lord’s Supper, yet  
 in truth do not perform that Duty, their Divisions being ut-  
 terly inconsistent with, and overthrowing the Design and In-  
 tention of this sacred Rite. That it was but a Part of the *Co-*  
*rinthian*

their Guilt was confin'd to their Assemblies, but rather to shew the great Aggravation thereof; that their Animosities, Contentions and Divisions followed them even into the Place of Divine Worship; that the Effects of their *Envy* and *Strife* † were plainly visible in the most solemn Parts of God's Service; that they could not join together like Brethren, no not in partaking of the Lord's Supper; but that they separated into Parties and Factions in the very Performance of this great Duty. This proves the monstrous height their Divisions were come to, and as fully proves that their Heart-burnings, Jealousies, Hatreds, together with the other numerous and wicked concomitants of their Schisms\*, possess'd them before their assembling for divine Worship, and remain'd with them after their Assemblies were dismissed. The other Crime they are charg'd with, is, Excess. And if that part of them (for probably it was but a small part of the Church to whom this Crime is imputed, if that part of them) who were guilty of this were, as your Defender supposes, habitual Sinners, Drunkards, no doubt they were guilty of it at other Feasts, besides those which at that time attended the Holy Supper. There are yet other Crimes with which St. Paul here charges the Rich among them, such as Pride, contempt of the Poor, and want of Charity. Although these Vices discovered themselves in a very notorious manner at their Assemblies, yet I believe there's no one but must suppose that the guilty Persons

*rinthian* Church were herein guilty, seems evident from those Words added at the End of this Verse, *καὶ οὕτως ἔστω ὑμῖν*; and I believe this report is true with regard to some part of you.

† 1 Cor. iii. 3.

\* See 2 Cor. xii. 20.



Persons brought these evil Dispositions with them when they came, and carried them away again when they departed. The Guilt of the *Corinthians* therefore was not confin'd to their unchristian Behaviour at this very Rite. And this you seem yourself to have had in your Thoughts when you added the last Words of the forementioned Passage; *Without the least Encouragement to them from hence* (from laying aside their unchristian behaviour at this Rite, and partaking of it in a serious and christian Manner) *to hope for God's Favour without their Amendment*, i. e. without their future Amendment; which evidently supposes that their Guilt lay not merely in their unchristian Behaviour at this Rite, for if it is taken for granted, that this was amended by their partaking in a serious and christian manner; but that there was other Guilt still remaining upon them after their thus partaking, which, if they did not amend, would deprive them of God's Favour. Shall we take your Words, Sir, in this Sense, i. e. shall we for once suppose that your confining the Guilt of the *Corinthians* to the very time of their partaking was an Oversight? Will they then bear any other Interpretation than that your Defender has put on them? If we must consider them as they stand connected with the Context, I believe not. It's very plain that you suppose here the *Corinthians* might come to the Sacrament in a serious and christian manner, even though they did not amend for the future. And should it be pretended, contrary to the plain Import of your Words, that you mean no more than that St. Paul required them first to amend their Lives, and then come to the Sacrament, how is this Sentence connected with what goes before, and what fol-

lows, or where is the Pertinence of it to the Point you are there making out, which is, that habitual Sinners may be worthy Partakers altho' they continue in their sinful Habits? There can therefore I think be no other Meaning given to this Passage of yours, than that your Defender has put on it. If so, I have already prov'd that there's nothing true in it except the last Words. The Guilt of the *Corinthians* lay not *merely* in their unchristian Behaviour at this Rite. They were discouraged by St. Paul from coming to it till they had *actually* amended, so as to be able to approve themselves to their own Consciences after a strict *Examination* into their Temper and Conduct; and this Discouragement was so very great that it unquestionably amounted to the strictest *Prohibition* that they should not come till they had reform'd both their Minds and their Behaviour; nor does St. Paul *suppose* it to be their Duty to come before such a Reformation, unless it was their Duty to come to their own Condemnation; much less does he *require* them to come; nor does he say one Word to make us believe that he thought they cou'd come in a *serious and Christian manner*, till they had amended the Faults he lays to their Charge; but it is indeed true, *that he gives them not the least Encouragement to hope for God's Favour*, although they should come to the Sacrament, *without their Amendment*, but on the contrary, very plainly tells them, that God would execute his Judgments on them for so doing.

8. Your Defender says, N. 4. p. 1. col. 3. " In  
 " the common manner of Polemical Writers,  
 " the Author of the Remarks has laid hold of  
 " Independent Passages to cavil at, without Can-  
 " dour enough to consider them, as they really  
 " are, connected with the whole Design of the  
 " Book."

“ Book,” and a little after says, “ that they  
 “ should be consider’d as an *Explanation*, not a  
 “ *Contradiction*.” The *Independent Passages* re-  
 ferr’d to are, that wherein you make it necessary  
 to a worthy receiving, that a Person come *with*  
*an honest Resolution to do the Will of Christ*; and  
 that other where you seem also to think it neces-  
 sary that he come *with such Dispositions of Mind as*  
*become Christians*. You very well know, Sir, that  
 it is the main *Design* or Drift of many Pages at least  
 of your Book, that I have argued against; and that  
 these *Independant Passages* as he calls them, I am  
 so far from *carvilling at* that they fall in entirely with  
 my own Sentiments, and that I have endeavour’d  
 to *explain* the Drift or Design of those Pages by  
 these Passages; but to reconcile them, or clear  
 them of a *Contradiction*, I see but one pos-  
 sible way, and that is by supposing that habitual  
 Sinners may go on in their Wickedness till the  
 Moment they come to receive the Sacrament; that  
 at that time there may be an entire Change in them,  
 they may lay aside all their vicious Dispositions,  
 take up truly Christian ones, and become living  
 Members of Christ’s Body; that the Moment af-  
 ter they have received, they may resume their sin-  
 ful Habits, and be no longer the Servants of Christ,  
 but the Subjects of Satan. In this manner indeed  
 there may be a Reconcilement, and there are seve-  
 ral things concurring to make it believed, that this  
 is your true Scheme; such as your insisting so  
 much on it that the Crime of unworthy re-  
 ceiving is confin’d to the Frame of our Minds  
 and our Behaviour *at* the very time of per-  
 forming this religious Duty; \* your Endeavours  
 to

\* Plain Account, p. 76 and 80. Why this is made a Pro-  
 position, and the Word *at* distinguished with Capitals, I can-  
 not

to prove that habitual Sinners may perform the Duties of Faith and Prayer in a *worthy* Manner; † and that peculiar Notion of yours, that habitual Sinners may be *sincere and serious* || *Christians*. Now, Sir, if this be your Scheme, why were you not so kind to give us it at once in a few plain Words? Why do you suffer us to puzzle on in the Dark through so very many Pages, before we can possibly collect it? Why was it not made one of your Propositions? If this were the great Secret you intended to communicate to the World, most certainly it deserv'd a principal Place, and might well have been writ in Capitals. The World having been wholly unus'd to your Sense of those Terms, *Serious Christians* and *Serious and Christian Manner*, for well nigh these 1700 Years, you might very well think it would be no easy matter for them to reach your Meaning, without some more direct and explicit Definition of them than you have any where given, and that this would be a perpetual Blind to them in reading your Book. If this be your *real* Scheme, I have already made it appear, that 'tis utterly irreconcilable with St. *Paul's* Words. And in what I shall have occasion immediately to add from another

Pas-

not for the Heart of me see, except it be to prove that no previous Qualification whatever, is necessary towards the worthy receiving the Lord's Supper. For if any one single Qualification be allow'd as absolutely necessary before *the very time* of receiving, this Observation is to as little purpose as though a 100 were made so, both before and after. Now the *Plain Account*, if I mistake not, insists upon one Qualification, at least, as absolutely necessary before the Time of Receiving, and that is, *a true Faith in Christ as sent into the World by God*. p. 110.

† *Plain Account*, p. 85, 86.

|| See the small Additions made to the second Edition of the *Remarks*, p. 7, 8.



Passage of yours, I shall fully prove that as it is far from being the Scripture Scheme, so neither is it consistent with some other Sentiments of yours deliver'd in this Book.

Give me leave then, Sir, before I take notice of what your Defender has said concerning Preparation for the Sacrament, to remark upon some things you have asserted upon that Subject. You say, p. 74. "The Duty of Preparation for the Holy Communion is entirely founded upon these few Words of St. Paul's, *Let a Man examine himself.*" I am very far from thinking this to be true. I always understood that it was founded upon the Nature of the Thing itself, and that it would have been equally a Duty whether St. Paul had ever wrote those Words or not. It can be no difficult matter, I think, to prove this.

By receiving the Lord's Supper, Persons, to use your own Words, \* "profess themselves to be under the Governance and Influence of Christ, to have Communion or Fellowship with him as Head, and with all their Christian Brethren, as *Fellow-members* of the same Body of which he is the Head." Can such Persons who by making this Profession tell an Untruth, be said to be worthy Receivers? As for Instance, an habitual Sinner who is conscious that he is so in love with his Sins, that he is unwilling to part with them, and cannot bring himself to a final Determination to leave them, can he with Truth profess himself to be under the *Governance and Influence* of Christ? Is he not in actual Rebellion against Christ, and under the Government and Influence of Satan? Again, an habitual Sinner who has continued in the Practice of his Vices

to

to the time he comes to partake of the Holy Sacrament, and then imagines he has taken up a Resolution to break off from all his evil Habits, and to yield universal Obedience to Christ's Commands; can he with Truth profess himself to have *Communion or Fellowship with Christ as Head, and with all Christians as Fellow-members of the same Body of which he is the Head?* How shall he know that his Resolution is sincere, I mean, that it is such as will take effect? I believe there is no one, who has had any Experience of Mankind; but very well knows that nothing is more frequent than for Persons, who have thought themselves most sincere in their Resolutions at the time of making them, to break through them afterwards, with as much ease as though they had never made them. How then can any Man know that a sudden Resolution *taken upon the Spot,* is such that he shall not soon after be tempted to alter? If he cannot know this, his Relation to Christ and the Saints, must at present also be a thing unknown to him. And for a Man to affirm a thing that is unknown to him, has been always determin'd to be a wilful Lye. But supposing that which cannot be, supposing it were possible for this Man to know that his Resolution is most sincere, such, which if his Life be spared, will certainly take effect, yet you, Sir, have fully determin'd that this alone will not give him an Interest in Christ as his Head, or secure any Benefit from him. You put into the Mouth of your Communicant these Words, p. 123.

“ I have learned from the Holiness of thy Nature, and thy Son's express Declarations in his Gospel, not to expect either Pardon through him, or any Benefit from him, but upon the Terms proposed in his Gospel; the utter forsak-

I

“ ing

“ing of all Sin and Immorality, and the ACTUAL  
 “Amendment and Reformation of what is truly  
 “blameworthy in my Temper or my Behaviour.”

Now with what Truth can that Person profess him-  
 self to be under the Governance and Influence of  
 Christ, and to have Communion with him as  
 Head, that can expect no Benefit from him? Here

you expressly declare that without ACTUAL  
 Amendment no such is to be expected. You speak

to the same purpose in your own Name, p. 166,

167. “The effectual Re-establishment of the

“Christian Covenant on our part, if it has

“been shaken by our Sins, can be only com-

“passed by that ACTUAL Amendment which is

“part of the Covenant.— And this being

“so, that the ACTUAL Amendment of our Lives

“is the only Security to this Covenant on our

“part; it follows, that neither the partaking

“of the Lord’s Supper, nor any thing else

“which is not ACTUAL Amendment, can be

“spoken of with any Propriety under that

“Character.” No habitual Sinner then, what-

ever firm and good Resolutions he has taken up,

can have any share in the Christian Covenant till

he has ACTUALLY amended. Christ is not his Co-

venanted Lord, nor can he expect any Blessing

from him. How then can he with any Truth

profess to have Communion with him as Head?

Let it be also observ’d what you say, p. 131.

“Almighty God on his Part, requiring and ac-

“cepting our due Performance of this part of our

“Duty (i. e. receiving the Supper of our Lord,)

“does by this assure us who come to profess our-

“selves the Disciples of Christ, that we are in his Fa-

“vour.” Now you put into the Mouth of your

Communicant, immediately after those Words

quoted before, this Saying: “I can expect no

“Favour

“Favour as Christ’s Disciple, but upon his  
 “Conditions,” the Conditions you have there  
 mentioned, are *the utter forsaking all Sin and*  
*Immortality, and the ACTUAL Amendment and*  
*Reformation of what is truly blameworthy in the*  
*Temper and Behaviour.* Can any Person be said  
 to receive the Holy Supper in a worthy Manner,  
 to whom this Assurance is not given? By your  
 own Words here it is absolutely determin’d that  
 he cannot; for you say, “Almighty God re-  
 quiring and accepting our due Performance of  
 this Duty, does by this assure us.” If then he  
 accepts our Performance of this Duty, he hereby  
 assures us that we are in his Favour. But can any  
 one perform this Duty in a worthy Manner, and  
 God not accept it? No, you yourself have ex-  
 plained \* the performing of a Duty *worthily*, to  
 be the performing it in a manner acceptable to God.  
 It is as plain then from your own Words, as any  
 thing can possibly be, that no habitual Sinner can  
 have the Assurance of God’s Favour, can perform  
 this Duty acceptably, i. e. can be a worthy Receiver;  
 till the *actual Amendment and Reformation of what*  
*is truly blame-worthy in his Temper and Behaviour.*  
 The same thing is again to be concluded from the  
 Words which immediately follow in the same  
 page. “The Lord’s Supper may be justly  
 “look’d upon as a Token and Pledge to assure  
 “us of what it calls to our Remembrance, viz.  
 “that God is ready to pardon and bless us, up-  
 “on the Terms proposed by his Son: And conse-  
 “quently that we ARE received by him as the Dis-  
 “ciples of Christ, Members of his Body the  
 “Church, and Heirs of his heavenly Kingdom;  
 “in a word, as Persons entitled to all the Happi-  
 “nesses promised to Christians, if we be not want-  
 on before this thing



“ing to ourselves in other Parts of our Duty;” Whom does this Ordinance assure, as a Token and Pledge, that they are received by God as the *Disciples of Christ, Members of his Body the Church, and Heirs of his Heavenly Kingdom, entitled to all the Happinesses promis’d to Christians?* Those who have comply’d with the *Terms proposed by his Son, i. e. those who have forsaken all Sin and Immorality, and have ACTUALLY amended and reformed their Temper and Behaviour.* These you tell us here, *God is ready to pardon and bless, and these alone you have told us before, are the Persons who can expect any Benefit from him.* Habitual Sinners then, till such time as they have *actually amended and reformed,* are not received by God as the *Disciples of Christ, Members of his Body the Church, and Heirs of his Heavenly Kingdom;* consequently then they are not the *Disciples of Christ, not Members of his Body, not Heirs of the Heavenly Kingdom;* for were they such most certainly they would be received as such, by Almighty God. When therefore an Habitual Sinner by receiving the Sacrament, does in the most solemn Manner, *profess himself a Disciple of Christ, and Member of his Body,* does he profess the Thing that is true? Does he receive *worthily?* You add at the End of the Sentence, “If we be not wanting to our selves in other parts of our Duty;” which evidently implies, that if we be thus wanting, *i. e. if we are habitual Sinners,* we are not received by God as the *Disciples of Christ, and Heirs of the Heavenly Kingdom;* the Consequence of which is, that we receive *unworthily.* And to make all this the more clear, you have said, p. 145. “A *Disposition* towards Amendment, a *Resolution* to amend, are very good Steps, and these are virtually implied in our

C 2

“pro-

“ professing ourselves Christians, and remembering Christ as our Lord and Master at his Table. But *neither this Disposition, nor this Resolution, let them be never so sincere, are themselves ACTUAL Amendment.*” Since then the *best Disposition*, and the *sincere Resolution* are not *actual* Amendment, they cannot even according to your own Sentiments, make a Man a *worthy Receiver*.

There is nothing more certain, Sir, than that professed Christians are divided into two Sorts, the Children of God who are Heirs of Heaven, and the Children of the Devil who are Heirs of Hell. Such who have comply'd with the Gospel Terms and live in some good Measure answerably to their Profession, are of the former. Habitual Sinners, because they have not complied with the Terms of the Gospel, are of the latter. I never heard or read the least hint that any of these were *serious* Christians till I read your Book. Were they in earnest in what they profess, surely they would act more agreeably to their Profession. They are Christians in nothing but the bare Name. In truth, are Rebels against Christ, and Subjects of his Adversary's Kingdom. Can these perform any religious Service in a manner acceptable to God? You argue that they may from, *p. 84 to p. 90.* against the whole current of Scripture from one End of the Bible to the other. Are not habitual Sinners represented as the Objects of God's Displeasure, and their Services as unacceptable and odious, *Psal. vii. 11. and xi. 5. Prov. xv. 8, 9, 26. and xxi. 27. and xxviii. 9. If. i. 11. &c. and lix. 2. and lxvi. 3. Amos v. 21, &c. Mat. v. 23, 24. John ix. 31. James ii. 10, 11. 1 John ii. 15. and iii. 8, 10?* You instance particularly in Faith and Prayer. The Faith

Faith of these habitual Sinners, you say p. 86. is  
 “ that same Faith which influences good Chri-  
 “ stians to a truly Christian Practice.” Yes, if  
 a dead Corpse and a living Man be the same.  
 The Life and Soul of Faith is Dependance,  
 Trust, Confidence. The habitual Sinner may  
 yield Assent to this Proposition, that Jesus Christ  
 is the Saviour of the World, but does he place  
 any Dependance on this Truth? No. Does he  
 trust in Christ as a Saviour? No. Has he that  
 entire Confidence in the Things related and pro-  
 mised by him, as to embark the whole of his  
 Comfort and Happiness, both here and hereaf-  
 ter, upon this and no other Bottom? No.  
 What Sort of Faith then is this? Just sufficient  
 to inform him in his Duty. And the *Servant*  
*that knew his Lord's Will and did it not, was beat-*  
*en with many Stripes.* Was this Knowledge of  
 his acceptable and pleasing to his Lord? I trow  
 not. Knowledge like Riches is not itself morally  
 good nor morally evil, but the Use of it. You  
 say “ there are wicked Persons whose Prayer  
 “ itself is an Abomination to the Lord. But  
 “ these can be only such as have Hearts wickedly dis-  
 “ posed and far from God, at the very time when  
 “ they pray.” But Solomon says, *the Sacrifice of*  
*the wicked is Abomination: How much more when he*  
*bringeth it with a wicked Mind.* As much as to  
 say, that God rejects the Service of a wicked  
 Man with Abhorrence at all times, but much  
 more when his Heart is *wickedly disposed at the ve-*  
*ry time* he is offering the Service. Solomon also  
 says, *He that turneth away his Ear from hearing the*  
*Law, even his Prayer shall be Abomination.* Can  
 there be a more clear Description of the habitual  
 Sinner given in Words than this? Does not eve-  
 ry one who allows himself in a vicious Course

turn away his Ear from bearing the Law, which forbids *that* Sin he indulges himself in? But you have your self wholly given up what you are here contending for, at least it appears so to me, by what you have added p. 87. "It is true, the *very* " *Faith and Prayer* of such a Person will aggravate his *Guilt*, and consequently his *Condemnation*, unless he amend his whole Behaviour." Will the righteous Judge of all then punish this Man in the other World for those *very* Duties which he was pleased with, and accepted at his Hands in this? Can any Thing sound more harsh, or seem more disagreeable to Justice? The plain truth is, that he who continues in love with his sinful Habits, cannot pray. For Prayer is not the uttering of Words, but Desires. It consists in the earnest Desire of the Mind. How then can that Man be said to pray that he may be obedient to God's Commands, who truly desires to continue in his Sins? Or how can that Man be said to pray to God to assist him in his Endeavours to amend his Life, who is conscious to himself that he is not in earnest in any Endeavours he uses to that End? Does such a Man desire Amendment? No, he only mocks God in pretending to pray to him. You very justly say, "No good Man would discourage a Sinner *sincerely* " disposed to call upon God, in order to *Amendment and Reformation of Life*." Most certainly not, if he finds in himself a Desire to amend. For all Amendment must have a Beginning, and Prayer is the proper Duty in which to express the Desire of it. But at the holy Sacrament, as I have made it appear from your own Words, he must proceed further, and profess his *actual* Amendment.

Though



Though I know that you are not a Friend to Excommunication, yet I can't forbear asking you, Why Persons were cut off from the Church in the primitive Times? You have already told us,\* from the Apostle *Paul*, one Reason was, that they might not corrupt others. But does not the very cutting them off, evidently suppose another Reason? Which is, that they were like dead Branches, or mortified Limbs. They were not living Members of Christ's Body, and therefore were separated from it. They were not the *Children* and *Heirs* of God, and therefore were removed from his Family. The only Difference between habitual Sinners excommunicated, and habitual Sinners not excommunicated, is, that the Sin of the one is notorious, the Sin of the other is concealed. The latter therefore are as really dead Members, as were the former before their being cut off. And if we should say that the Church had this further End in View, that such Persons might not go on to aggravate their own Condemnation by their repeated Perjuries, was it not a thing very proper? Ought not then those Persons who are conscious to themselves that they are equally guilty, although their Sins are concealed from the Eye of the World and the Notice of the Church, to be thus kind to themselves, and withdraw from the Communion till they have actually amended?

If the Representation that has been now made of the Nature of this Ordinance, and of the Persons qualified to partake of it be a just one; it hence clearly follows that the Necessity of a previous Examination arises from the Nature of the Thing itself, and is only confirm'd to us by *St. Paul's* Precept. And I think I must have your

Conj  
 Plain Account, p. 95.

Concurrence with me in this Conclusion. For I have fully made it out from your own Words, that every one who partakes of this Ordinance, thereby professes himself a *real* Disciple of Christ, (not such in *Intention* and *Resolution* only, but truly such by an *actual* Compliance with the Terms of his Gospel,) a *living* Member of his Body the Church, and an *Heir* of his Heavenly Kingdom, *entitled* to all the Happinesses promised to Christians. And ought not every one to be satisfied of the Truth of this, before he makes the solemn Profession of it at the Lord's Table? Will not this make it necessary in many, very many Cases, that a Man enquire into his past Temper and Conduct, and be approved by his Conscience after Tryal and Examination, as the Word used by *St. Paul* signifies? It's certainly true, that such Persons who are conscious to themselves that they maintain a steady Course of Obedience to Christ's Commands, although they receive the Communion without any previous Warning, and consequently without any Time spent in preparing themselves for it, commit not the least Fault, being habitually prepared. Nay, it is my Opinion, that should they neglect it meerly for this Reason, because they had not spent time before-hand to prepare for it, they wou'd be justly blame-worthy. Yet to be sure, it is always an eligible thing even to them, when they have previous Warning, and sufficient Opportunity, to spend some time before-hand in Meditation and Prayer, that they may perform this Duty with the greater Profit and Delight. God forbid, Sir, that I should lessen the Number of those who are steady in their Obedience; but I believe you will readily allow, that it's not equal to the unsteady, who have dangerous Relapses

into Sin, though they rise again, and are not so overcome, as to be *habitually* guilty of it. Hence then it appears evident, that in *most* Cases Time spent in Preparation beforehand is necessary, in *all* Cases convenient and eligible.

From what has been said it appears very evident, that if you have any Compassion for your Disciples, you ought to make your *Plain Account* yet *plainer*. For how is it possible they should know which way to govern themselves, when they have so uncertain a Guide? Telling them in one Place, that *habitual Sinners* may perform *this Duty well and acceptably*, notwithstanding their Failure in other Parts of Duty; telling them in other Places by as plain and direct Consequence as can be drawn from Words, that God will not *accept* their Performance of this Duty, without *actual Amendment*; expressly assuring them in one Place, *p. 111.* that worthy Receivers are “so acceptable to Christ, that  
“they may be said to  *dwell in him, to be one*  
“with him, that is, that Christ and they, to all  
“the Intents and Purposes of true Religion, shall  
“be in *perfect Friendship and Union together* ;” yet in many other Places as fully and strongly assuring them, that *habitual Sinners* cannot be in his Friendship or Favour, till they have *forsaken all Sin and Immorality*, and have *actually* reformed? Shou’d you not also in kindness to those Persons who are guilty of *sinful Habits*, and whom you have encouraged to come to the Holy Sacrament, inform them with what secret Meaning they are to *profess themselves under the Governance and Influence of Christ, to have Communion or Fellowship with him as Head, and with all their Christian Brethren, as Fellow-members of the same Body, of which he is the Head*? Are they to profess themselves

D

living

living or dead Members? But what Communion can *dead* Members have with the Head, or how can they be said to be *influenc'd* or *govern'd* by it? Or will you teach them how they may be Subjects and Rebels, the Servants of Christ and the Slaves of Sin, at the same time?

You say, p. 73, 74. "In the *publick Office* of our Church, it is observable that the Duty of *Examination* is proposed to them, who are at that very time supposed to remain in the Church as *Communicants*. The Exhortation and Threatning of *St. Paul* to the *Corinthians* are *then* read to them; they are called upon at that very time, to judge themselves, and to approve themselves, by coming with the proper Dispositions to the Lord's Table. All which must be supposed to be founded upon this, That even so *short* an *Examination* in the Church itself, just before the partaking of the Bread and Wine, may be *sufficient* to satisfy a true Christian, whether he is at that time coming to the Lord's Supper with a Temper and Behaviour suitable to the Institution, according to what *St. Paul* has said about it, and that he may examine and judge himself, at that very time, enough to be fully satisfied in this essential Point." I always understood that the Design of the first Part of the Exhortation was to deter such from coming to the Sacrament, who had not, according to the former Exhortation made to them the Week before, complied with *St. Paul's* Rule, who had not so repented of their Sins as to be approved of their own Consciences. And that the Words you fix upon cannot be understood in your Sense, will easily appear by transcribing the whole Sentence. "Judge, therefore, yourselves, Brethren, that ye be not judged of the Lord; repent you truly for your Sins past; have



“ have a lively and stedfast Faith in Christ our  
 “ Saviour; *Amend your lives, and be in perfect Cha-*  
 “ *rity with all Men, so shall ye be meet Partakers*  
 “ of those holy Mysteries.” This Exhortation  
 is plainly to inform them what is required of them  
 in order to their worthy receiving, that if they  
 find these Qualifications wanting in themselves,  
 they should not presume to stay and partake, as is  
 most evident from two of the Things exhorted  
 to, which I doubt not you your self will  
 allow are utterly impracticable in the short time  
 you speak of, and they are Amendment of Life;  
 if they have liv’d in Sin, together with Restitutio-  
 on and Reconciliation implied in the Words,  
*be in perfect Charity*, if they have fail’d in those  
 Duties. How then you can say *that even so short*  
*an Examination in the Church* is here supposed  
 sufficient I cannot see: You add indeed, *to satisfy*  
*a true Christian*. If by a *true Christian* you mean  
 a Person steady in a Course of Obedience to God’s  
 Commands, it is allowed on all Hands that time  
 for Preparation to such a one is not absolutely ne-  
 cessary; but then this makes not at all for your  
 Purpose, and the Observation might as well have  
 been omitted. And if under the Character of a  
*true Christian* you intend to include the *habitual*  
*Sinner*, your Observation is manifestly false.  
 To shew more fully the Sense of our Church, I  
 shall transcribe a Passage from each of the two  
 foregoing Exhortations, which cannot, I think,  
 be liable to a Misinterpretation. In the first Ex-  
 hortation appointed to be read on the Sunday or  
 Holy-Day immediately preceding the Day when  
 the Holy Communion is to be celebrated, are  
 these Words: “ Which (holy Sacrament) being  
 “ so divine and comfortable a thing to them  
 “ who receive it worthily, and so dangerous to  
 “ them

“ them that will presume to receive it unworthi-  
 “ ly ; my Duty is to exhort you *in the mean sea-*  
 “ *son to consider* the Dignity of that holy My-  
 “ stery, and the great Peril of the unworthy re-  
 “ ceiving thereof ; and so to search and examine your  
 “ own Consciences (and that not lightly, and after  
 “ the Manner of Dissemblers with God ; but so)  
 “ that ye may come holy and clean to such a hea-  
 “ venly Feast in the Marriage Garment requi-  
 “ red by God in holy Scripture, and be received  
 “ as worthy Partakers of that holy Table. The  
 “ Way and Means thereto is first to examine  
 “ your Lives and Conversations by the Rule of  
 “ God’s Commandments, and whereinfoever  
 “ ye shall perceive yourselves to have offended  
 “ either by Will, Word, or Deed, there to be-  
 “ wail your own Sinfulness, and to confess your  
 “ selves to Almighty God, with full Purpose  
 “ of Amendment of Life. And if ye shall per-  
 “ ceive your Offences to be such as are not only  
 “ against God, but also against your Neigh-  
 “ bours, then ye shall reconcile yourselves unto  
 “ them, being ready to make Restitution and  
 “ Satisfaction, according to the uttermost of  
 “ your Powers, for all Injuries and Wrongs  
 “ done by you to any other ; and being likewise  
 “ ready to forgive others that have offended you,  
 “ as ye would have Forgiveness of your Offen-  
 “ ces at God’s Hand : For otherwise the re-  
 “ ceiving the holy Communion doth nothing else  
 “ but increase your Damnation. Therefore if  
 “ any of you be a Blasphemer of God, an Hin-  
 “ derer or Slanderer of his Word, an Adulterer,  
 “ or be in Malice or Envy, or in any other  
 “ grievous Crime, repent you of your Sins, or  
 “ else come not to that holy Table.” In the other  
 Exhortation to be used when the People neglect

to come to the holy Communion are these Words,  
 “ If any Man say, *I am a grievous Sinner, and*  
 “ *therefore am afraid to come* : Wherefore then do  
 “ ye not repent and amend? ” I think it would  
 be very difficult to set this Matter in a clearer  
 or stronger Light, than it is here done. Can a-  
 ny one imagine after reading this, that a *short*  
*Examination in the Church itself, just before the par-*  
*taking, is judged sufficient by the publick Office of our*  
*Church* ? Is it not plainly and fully insisted on, that  
 a Person so examine himself as to satisfy his Con-  
 science of his Repentance and Amendment, be-  
 fore he presume to come to this Ordinance?

I shall proceed now to what your *Defender* has  
 said of Preparation for the Sacrament, *N. 5. p. 1.*  
*col. 1.* “ How seasonable and pertinent it was to  
 “ enlarge on that Head (of worthy receiving  
 “ without any formal Preparation) will appear  
 “ any to Man that knows the *Superstitious Notions*  
 “ *many have, of previously locking themselves in*  
 “ *their Closets to meditate on the Death and Pas-*  
 “ *sion of Christ, &c.* as they are advis’d by weak  
 “ *Books of Devotion.* ” Some People esteem it  
*Superstition* to read the Bible, or to give credit to  
 any thing that is therein related. This Writer  
 calls a Person’s retiring *to meditate on the Death*  
*and Passion of Christ*, before receiving the Sacra-  
 ment, a *superstitious Notion*. I suppose, had he heard  
 either of the two foregoing things asserted con-  
 cerning the Bible, he wou’d not have scrupled to  
 accuse those Sayings as *profane*. For my part, I  
 think this last Assertion not less *profane*. And  
 am persuaded that had that awful Reverence for  
 the Death of Christ, the most astonishing Method  
 of our Salvation, affected his Mind to such a  
 degree as the Importance of the Subject deserves,  
 when he wrote these Words ; it cou’d never have  
 enter’d

p. 11.

enter'd his Thoughts, much less cou'd he have deliberately wrote, that a Retirement to *meditate on the Death and Passion of Christ* before the Communion, is a *superstitious* Notion. This Proposition, Sir, is urged in your Defence. It cannot be doubted therefore, but that the Writer thinks it agreeable to your Sentiments, and that this is one sort of *Superstition* which you are guarding against in your Book. I can never believe it to be so, till you expressly declare it. But this I must own, I apprehended from the first reading your Book, that your declaring in such general Terms against *Superstition* in your Preface, without condescending to name every particular Sort of *Superstition*, which you aim'd at in the various Parts of your Work, wou'd mislead many to call that *Superstition* which you never judg'd to be so. As the Inclination of the present Time is entirely on the contrary side, I cannot possibly see of what Service it is to attack *Superstition* in the general. Had you specified every particular Practice or Notion, with regard to this Sacrament, that you esteem superstitious, and then endeavour'd to confute it, this might have serv'd the Purpose you propos'd; but the Method you have taken has, I think, a very bad Tendency, and I look upon what this Writer has advanced as a plain and publick Proof thereof.

The Reason given by your *Defender* against making previous *Meditation on the Death and Passion of Christ* a Preparation for this Ordinance, is something extraordinary. He says "this is in truth to make the *very Essence of the Rite* a Preparation for itself," To meet with so inaccurate an Expression in this Writer was no Wonder, but to find that he had borrowed it from you, I must own surpriz'd me. Yes, Sir, you



you call the *Remembrance of Christ* the *Essence of this Rite*, p. 158. This, no doubt, must have been a Slip of your Pen. For you very well know, that the *Rite* or Ceremony is the joint partaking of Bread that has been blessed and broken, and of Wine that has been blessed, and that the *Remembrance of Christ* is properly no part of the *Rite* or Ceremony, but the *primary End* for which this *Rite* was instituted, as you yourself express it, p. 58. implying very truly, that there are other more *remote Ends* for which it was appointed; so that the *Remembrance of Christ* is not indeed the *sole End* of this *Rite*. Now how it can be said that the *Essence* of a *Rite* or Ceremony is not the *Rite* it self, is *no Part* of that *Rite*, but is a *Part* only of the *End* for which that *Rite* was appointed, will be difficult to make out. However, upon this Mistake, plain as it is, your *Defender* has founded a very notable Argument against meditating on the Death of Christ, as a Preparation for the Sacrament. And is it possible that any Man, who calls himself a Christian, should find fault with Persons for retiring to spend some serious Thoughts on the Passion of their Saviour, before they approach that sacred Institution which was expressly appointed by him for the affectionate Remembrance of this his unspeakable Love? Is it then so easy a matter for Persons immers'd in the Hurries and Business of Life, to shake off all Thoughts of their worldly Affairs immediately upon the Spot, at a Moment's Warning, and to keep their Minds intent on the great Christian Sacrifice, and the Benefits thereby purchased? Has every one so perfect a Command of his Thoughts, that he can immediately employ them on the great Objects of our Redemption? And suppose he had, what more proper way cou'd be devis'd

devis'd in order to our attaining the more remote Ends for which this Ordinance was instituted, such as the inflaming our Love to Christ, the strengthening our Resolution for his Service, the increasing our Desire after a greater Likeness to him, the raising our Hope and Trust in him, and the enlarging our Hearts towards all his Members, than by spending some time beforehand in considering the Greatness of his Condescension and Sufferings, together with the End for which he dy'd?

I can well remember the Time, and I hope it's a thing not wholly laid aside yet, when Persons retir'd into their Closets every Sunday Morning, not only to offer up the accustomed Morning Sacrifice of Thanksgiving, but also by Prayer, Reading and Meditation, to prepare for attending the Ordinances of publick Worship. And it has been usual for those who have publish'd Forms of Prayer to assist the piously dispos'd in these their Devotions. I cannot at present recollect any that have been made publick, wherein this has been wholly neglected till yours came out. If they have not compos'd Prayers peculiar for *Sunday*, they have at least drawn up some Clauses which were proper to be added to their Forms on that Day. It's very possible your *Defender*, encourag'd by your total Silence herein, may call this also *Superstition*, and say it is making the very *Essence* of divine Worship a *Preparation for itself*. And if he does, I shall still go on to believe, as I have hitherto done, that the surest Method to make Improvement by publick Ordinances, is to prepare for our Attendance on them by private Devotion. But others, Sir, may with more Reason be hence induced to question, whether you esteem the religious Observation of the first Day in the  
Week,

Week, and our assembling for God's Worship on that Day, *Divine Institutions*, as being persuaded that if you will rigorously defend the first six Propositions of your Book, together with their Annotations, you can never make them appear to be so.

Your Advocate often hints, or takes for granted, that I acquiesce in the Truth of every Part of your Book which I have not remark'd upon. But it is very far from being so. What I intended when I wrote the *Remarks*, was to take notice of those things only, which I thought of the greatest Moment, and which I apprehended might have a bad Effect. If I may speak my Sentiments freely, there are but few things in it that will bear a strict and impartial Examination. You have not spoken your Mind fully and clearly concerning the *Consecration* of the Elements; but if your *Defender* understands you aright, he, I think, makes you determine absolutely against it. *N. 10. p. 2. col. 1.* On the other hand, it is my Opinion, that if ever there was any thing that may have been said to be dedicated, consecrated, or offered to Almighty God, the Bread and Wine at the Eucharist are such. And the Proof of this I take to be so very easy and obvious, that it's my Admiration any Man should make a Question of it. Are not these set apart by a divine Command for a religious Purpose, a Use wholly of God's own appointing? What cou'd be said more of the Shew-bread, or indeed of any of the Offerings or dedicated things under the Law of *Moses*? You say, "The \*  
" personal Appropriation of the Bread and  
" Wine to the serious and religious Remem-  
" brance of the Body and Blood of Christ, is a  
" sort of *Consecration* of them, which is the Du-  
" ty of every Communicant himself, and with-  
" out  
E

“ out which all other Consecrations that have gone before will do him no Service at all.” But if a Person who is unqualified receives, will not the foregoing Consecration do him a Disservice? Will it not highly aggravate his Condemnation? Has he not been guilty of profaning that which was most holy?

I readily allow that the Word *εὐλογῆσας* signifies, having blessed, praised, or given thanks to God; but I can by no means admit that the Evangelists, and St. Paul, by the Use of this, or even of the other Word, *ευχαριστίας*, designed to tell us that our Saviour did nothing more than give Thanks, and that he join'd no Petition with his Thanksgiving. The Word *εὐλογῆν* is made use of both by our Saviour and St. Paul, when we are commanded to bless them that curse and persecute us, *Mat. v. 44. Rom. xii. 14.* Will you say, it means nothing more than the praising God, that he in his Providence has permitted these Persons to revile and persecute us, and not the offering up one Petition that God would forgive them, and grant them Repentance and a better Mind? The same Word is used when it's said that *Melchizedeck* blessed *Abraham*, *Heb. vii. 1.* Is it thence to be concluded that he only gave Thanks to God for the Victory *Abraham* had obtained over his Enemies? And that although he was Priest of the most high God, and a Type of Christ, *Melchizedeck* notwithstanding made no Intercession for him? Again, we have the same Word when our Lord blessed his Disciples at his Ascension into Heaven, *Luke xxiv. 50, 51.* And when he laid his Hands on little Children and blessed them, *Mark x. 16.* Is it to be thought that he only blessed God for them, and did not offer up one kind Petition in their behalf? And when it is said by St.

Luke



*Luke ix. 16.* using the same Word, that he blessed the Loaves and the Fishes, why may we not conceive that he not only gave thanks to God, but also pray'd \* that these might become a sufficient Support to the fainting Multitude? As to the Word *ευχαριστῆν*, the Apostle *Paul* in his own Practice always joined Thanksgiving and Prayer together, *Rom. i. 8. Eph. i. 16. Phil. i. 3. Col. i. 3. 1 Thess. i. 2. Philem. iv.* and enjoins the Christians to whom he writes, to do the same, *1 Thess. v. 18. 1 Tim. ii. 1. Phil. iv. 6. Col. iv. 2.* Whence I take it, they were inseparable Companions, and that for this reason, the Words praying, blessing, and giving of Thanks, *προσεύχασθαι, εὐλογεῖν, and εὐχαριστῆν*, are used promiscuously for one another, *1 Cor. xiv. 14, 15, 16, 17. Luke xviii. 10, 11, 12, 13.* And what comes up yet more directly to the Point, the Apostle *Paul 1 Tim. iv. 3, 4, 5.* mentions both Thanksgiving and Prayer as customarily used by Christians before Meat, commanding to abstain from Meats which God hath created to be received with Thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth. For every Creature of God is good, and nothing to be refus'd if it be received with Thanksgiving (*μετὰ εὐχαριστίας*): For it is sanctified by the Word of God and Prayer, (*ὅσα ἐν τῷ ῥήματι.*) And *Grotius* † tells us both from the Writers of the

E. 2 *Talmud,*

\* *Christus panes multiplicaturus haud dubiè ad communes preces addidit proprias rei quæ tum agebatur. Grot. in Mat. xxvi. 26.*

† *Moris semper Judæis fuit, ut ex Thalmudicis Scriptoribus & Philone apparet, cibum nullum aut vinum sumere nisi prius Deo tanquam conditori donatorique laudes & grates egissent, additâ precatione: quod *יְהַלְלֵנוּ אֶת הַשֵּׁם אֱלֹהֵינוּ* [honorare Deum ut alimenti datorem] dixit Josephus: ipsam precationem *קדוש* id est *אַמְסֻמַּי* [sanctificationem] aut *בְּרַכָּה* id est *עֲלֵינוּ* [benedictionem]*

Bene

*Talmud*, and from *Philo*, that the *Jews* took no Sustainance without both praising God and praying to him at the same time. Have we not from these Things the greatest reason to conclude, that our blessed Lord when he had taken Bread, not only gave Thanks, but also prayed to the Father that his Spirit and Blessing might accompany the Performance of the Duty he was then instituting? And certainly it must be deem'd some Confirmation of this, that one of the earliest Writers \* among the Christians, not only speaks of Thanksgiving, but also of Prayer that was used in consecrating the Elements.

There's another Thing you advance with regard to this *Blessing* or *Thanksgiving*, which I can by no means agree with you in; and that is your excluding it from being any part, at least any essential part of the Institution. Your Words are these, p. 174. "The Essence of this Duty ought always to be consider'd as distinct from all *Expressions, Prayers* or *Thanksgivings*, which are made use of before and after it." For my part, I always thought that when St. Luke says, *Christ took Bread and gave Thanks, and brake it,* and

— Bene autem Paulus dicto loco (*i. e. Tim. iv. 4, 5*)  
 ευχαρισται [gratiarum actionem] explicat voce ευχαρισται  
 [precationis] erant enim ista conjuncta. *Grot. in Mat. xxvi.*  
 26. Conjuncta sunt gratiarum actio & preces: illa pro rebus  
 datis: hæc ut res prosint. Utrumque comprehenditur sub  
 nomine ברכה [benedictio] *Grot. in 1 Tim. iv. 5.*

\* Ἐπειτα θεωρεῖται πῶς θεωρεῖται ὁ ἀδελφὸν ἀρετῆς καὶ ποθέειν ὕδατος καὶ κρέμας. Καὶ ἔτι λαβὼν αἶνον καὶ ὄξω πῶς παρὶ τῶ ὅλων διὰ τῶ ὀνόματος τῶ ἡμῶν, καὶ τῶ πινόμενου τῶ ὅς ἐστι ἀναπνεύει καὶ συλλαβεῖται ὑπὲρ τῆ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν τοῦ παρ' αὐτῆς ὅτι πάλιν ποιεῖ. ὁ συνταλίσαντος πᾶς συλαβεῖται καὶ συλλαβεῖται, πᾶς ὁ παρὼν λαβὼς ἐπισημαίνει λέγων, ἀμὴν. Just. Mart. Apol. 2. Par. Ed. p. 97. Ἀρετῆς θεωρεῖται καὶ διὰ τῶ καὶ τῶ ὁξω καὶ συλαβεῖται ὁμοίως καὶ συλλαβεῖται ὅσην καὶ ναμὸς αὐτῶ ἀναπνεύει, καὶ ὁ λαβὼς ἐπισημαίνει λέγων, τοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ διὰ τοῦ καὶ ἡ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν αὐτῶ καὶ συλλαβεῖται ὅσην καὶ ναμὸς καὶ Id. ibid. p. 98.

and gave unto them, saying, *This is my Body which is given for you*, THIS DO IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME, these last Words had extended to the whole Action of our Saviour, to his taking Bread and giving Thanks, as well as to his breaking it, and giving it to his Disciples. And I never yet heard the least Reason to the contrary. It's remarkable that this part of the Action, *the taking the Bread, and giving Thanks, or blessing it*, is particularly recorded by three of the Evangelists, as well as by St. Paul. And I think it's not very probable, that St. Paul wou'd have stiled the Cup at this Sacrament, *the Cup of Blessing which we bless*, had he not esteemed the Blessing it to be of the Essence of the Duty. So early as *Justin Martyr's* time the Christians look'd upon the Elements \* to be no more than common Bread and common Wine, and not the representative Body and Blood of Christ, till the Eucharistical Prayer had been said over them; and I cannot but think this Notion descended to them from the Apostolick Institution. These, with several other things I omitted to remark upon, because I did not think them of such Importance as to make it necessary that your Readers should be immediately caution'd against them.

There's one Thing however I passed by, of much more Consequence, which indeed lies at the

\* *Οι καλέμβροι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι, διδασκὸν ἐκείνῳ τῷ παρ' ἐντων μεταλαβὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστιῶντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ τοῖς ὁ παρ' ἐντων ἀποτίσκει· καὶ ἡ τροφή αὐτῶν καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῖν εὐχαριστία. — ὁ γὰρ ὁ κοινὸν ἄρτον ἔδε κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν· ἀλλ' ὁ γὰρ τρέπον διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ σαρκοποιήσας Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔθεν, ὅπως καὶ τὸ εὐχὰς λόγῳ τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστιῶνται, τροφήν, ἥτις αἷμα καὶ σὰρξ καὶ μεταβολῶν πείρονται ἡμῶν, ἐκείνου τοῦ σαρκοποιῶντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα ἐδίδου ἡμῖν ἔδωκεν.* Just. Mart. Par. Ed. p. 97, 98.

the very Foundation, and that is, the Sense you put upon those Words of *St. Paul*, *not discerning the Lord's Body*. I well knew that if you enter'd the Lists with any Writer on the Subject of your Book, it would be absolutely necessary in the Course of the Debate, that the whole Context of *St. Paul* in that Place, should be thoroughly examin'd and set in a clear Light, and this together with my intended Brevity, were the Reasons I did not then remark upon it. Give me leave to supply that Defect now. I shall first cite your own Words, and then collect your Meaning from them as well as I can. "*Not discerning the Lord's Body*; that is, not considering *this Bread* as the Memorial of his *Body*; not making a sufficient Difference between *this Bread*, eaten at the *Lord's Supper* in memory of him, and a common Meal, even intemperately taken." p. 67. "We see it (*i. e.* the Crime of the *Corinthians*) plainly to be their eating this Bread, and drinking this Cup, — in such a manner, as plainly shewed that the *Bread* and *Wine* ordained for the Remembrance of our *Lord's Body* and *Blood* in this Rite, were not thought of by them so as to be discerned (or differenced, as the Word signifies) from *Bread* and *Wine* taken at a common Meal." p. 77. The Examination here mention'd by *St. Paul*, as regarding the *Lord's Supper*, is strictly speaking a Christian's Examination of his own Heart and Disposition, by the Institution of this holy Rite, in order to assure himself that he comes to the *Lord's Supper*, and will behave himself at it, not as a common Meal, or an ordinary eating and drinking, but as a particular Rite appointed by Christ." p. 71. "A true Christian needs not any length of time to assure his Heart of this. Neither



“ Neither can the Opportunities of this Solemnity come so suddenly upon him, but that he may certainly know himself to be prepared in this absolutely necessary Sense.” p. 75. Is it not plain from these Passages, that you think the *Corinthians* looked upon the Lord’s Supper as a common Meal? That whatever Notions they might retain of its having been appointed by Christ, it was still in their Value and Estimation no more than an ordinary eating and drinking, and that they attended it with the same Indifference as they sat down at their own Tables? Their Fault it seems was, that they did not *assure themselves* beforehand that they would come to the Lord’s Supper not as a common Meal, or an ordinary eating and drinking, but as a particular Rite appointed by Christ. And when they were actually partaking, that they DID NOT CONSIDER this Bread as the Memorial of Christ’s Body, but eat this Bread and drank this Wine in such a manner as plainly shewed that the Bread and Wine ordained for the Remembrance of our Lord’s Body and Blood in this Rite WERE NOT THOUGHT OF BY THEM, so as to be DIFFERENCED from Bread and Wine taken at a common Meal. There’s full and convincing Evidence, I think, that what you here lay to their Charge was not their Crime. You say \* that it is morally speaking impossible for any good and serious Christian to be guilty of this, and that in communicating after the Form of the Church of England, if a Person be serious and in earnest †, it is a thing impracticable. Was it not as impossible, was it not equally impracticable in the Church of Corinth? The Apostle Paul himself founded that Church, a large Number of Converts he made, and

\* Plain Account, p. 80.

† Plain Account, p. 120.

and spent a very considerable time among them, *Acts* xviii. 11. The Text says *he continued a Year and six Months teaching the Word of God among them.* It's added in the 18. v. *And Paul after this tarried there yet a good while.* We cannot well suppose that he dwelt there much less than two Years; during which time he not only carefully instructed them in the Nature and End of this Sacrament, as an Institution of Christ's own Appointment, but without doubt had very frequently administred it to them with his own Hands. He had left them but about three Years before he wrote this Epistle to them. Is it to be thought that in this short Space of Time they could be so entirely forgetful of his Instructions, as to go to this divine Appointment with the same Indifference, as to a *Common Meal*? Could they so very soon have lost all Remembrance of *St. Paul's* own Behaviour at this Sacrament, with what Solemnity he both administred it and partook of it himself? I can't but think these things must have made deeper Impressions on their Minds than to be wholly worn out in the short Space of three Years; especially if we consider that during this whole time the Lord's Supper was administred among them, and that every Occasion of receiving could not but bring afresh to their Memories the Directions *St. Paul* had given them, as well as his Exemplary Conduct at this Solemnity. Whence I conclude that it was no less *impossible*, no less *impracticable*, for the *Corinthians* to go to this Ordinance, as to an *ordinary eating and drinking*, than it is for Christians now, or rather that it was much more so.

What further convinces me that this cannot be the Thing which the Apostle *Paul* lays to their Charge, is his exhorting them to sit in Judgment upon



al of themselves, and which every Man must be a perfect Master of, the very Moment it's proposed to him?

I add further, that we have no reason to think that the *Corinthians* looked even upon the Feast which attended this Sacrament, as a *common Meal*. If I mistake not, you allow it was the general Practice in the Apostolick Times, to celebrate it *at or after Supper*, p. 184. Consequently this Supper must have been eaten in the Places where the Assemblies of Christians met for religious Purposes, as in Fact we find it was by the *Corinthians*. Does this look as if they esteemed it an ordinary eating and drinking? \* And since this was the general Practice of those Times, can it be doubted that this was the very Practice introduc'd among the *Corinthians* by St. Paul himself, that he taught them the Design of this attending Meal or Feast, and both by his Instruction and Practice, shewed them in what manner to distinguish between this, and that which was more properly the Eucharist? I think it cannot. It appears very plainly from St. Paul's Epistle to them, that after he left them there was some one or more Persons came among them, † *who built Wood, Hay, and Stubble, upon the Foundation he had laid*. These in all Probability were Judaizing Teachers ‖, as were the most of them who rais'd Disturbances in the Gentile Churches he had planted. Hence came the Disorders complain'd of in the Celebration of the Supper, or Love Feast, which attended this Sacrament. They taught the rich *Corinthians* to separate

\* Compare what is here said with the *Plain Account*, p. 60, 61.

† 1 Cor. iii. 10, 11, 12, &c.

‖ See 2 Cor. xi. 12. — 23.



separate from the Poor in their Assemblies, and brought in the Custom of Excessive drinking. The Scribes or Teachers among the *Jews*, treated the Poor with great Contempt\*; and such were the Traditions they held, that they thought themselves oblig'd to drink plentifully at some of their Feasts†, and particularly at the Passover‡.

They

\* They called them in Derision the *People of the Earth*; and it was a Proverb among them, *that the Holy Spirit rests not upon a poor Man*, Grot. in Mat. xij. Act. ii. 18. and *Whitby* on Mat. xi. 5. See also *John* vii. 9. and that a Partiality for the Rich and Neglect of the Poor, was brought very early into the Christian Church among the *Jewish* Converts. See *Jam.* ii. 1, 2, 3, 4. &c.

† The Feast of Purim is the Bacchanals of the *Jews*, which they celebrate with all manner of rejoicing, mirth and jollity, and therein indulge themselves in all manner of luxurious Excesses, especially in drinking Wine even to Drunkenness, which they think part of the Duty of the Solemnity, because it was by the Means of the Wine Banquet, they say, that *Ester* made the King's Heart merry and brought him into that good humour which inclined him to grant the Request which she made unto him for their Deliverance. And therefore they think *they ought* to make their Hearts merry also when they celebrate the Commemoration of it. *Dr. Prideaux's Conn. Fol. Ed. p. 250, 251.*

Legitur in Jure Talmudico, Penetur homo in Festo Purim se exhilarare vel inebriare, donec nesciat distinguere inter Maledictus sit Haman & Benedictus sit Mordecai. In Magilla Fol. 7. 2. vid. Buxtorf. Lex. Chald. in voce פורים p. 324.

‡ The *Jerusalem* Talmud says, "That the poorest Man in *Israel* was bound to drink off four Cups of Wine at the Passover, yea though he lived of the Alms Basket; and if he had no other ways to compass so much Wine, ~~and~~ he must sell or pawn his Coat, or hire out himself for four Cups of Wine. Our Rabbins deliver it for a Tradition, say the *Gemmarists*, that these four Cups ought to have in them a fourth Part of a *Hin*, all alike for Men, Women and Children." They might drink what they pleased more, but thus much they were all bound to drink by their Tradition. And although they usually drank their Wine mixed with Water at this Feast, yet *Maimonides* says, there was to be the fourth

Part

They did not this because they thought themselves at a *common Meal*, but for the contrary reason, because they were at a religious Entertainment, and in honour of the Festival. It was delivered down to them as the Method whereby they were to shew the great Value and Esteem they had for the Institution. These *Jewish Practices* were begun in the Church of *Corinth*. Upon this Account the Apostle highly blames them, and in Opposition hereto lays before them Christ's own Institution, as he had delivered it to them when present with them;

I cannot perceive the least Hint given by St. Paul, that he would have the *Corinthians* lay aside the Supper or Love Feast which he had taught them to celebrate together with the Sacrament. Had it been his Intention, as you affirm, p. 69. to persuade them to leave off this Feast, one would think he should not only have hinted it, but have told them plainly in so many Words; that although they had learn'd it both from his Instruction and Example when among them, yet it was now no longer proper for them to observe it, and that henceforth they ought to receive the Sacrament naked and stripp'd of this Attendant. In relating the Institution, he makes express mention of the Paschal Supper which accompanied it.\* And what he adds

Part of a Quarter of an Hin in every Cup, besides what Water was mingled with it. The whole Quantity of the four Cups put together, is by Dr. Arbutnot's Tables, according to the lowest Computation, one Quart and half a Pint of our Wine measure. We may hence judge that many of the weaker Heads must be necessarily drunk at this Feast; Rabban Gamaliel confesses, that this Quantity made him drunk, and it's apparent that many were usually drunk at this Feast from the Rules laid down by the Talmudists concerning those who slept at the Passover Meal. See *Lightfoot's Temple Sermons*, chap. 13. & Chörög, Cent. p. 61. fin. *vedi deusdill*

It's observable that the *Plain Account* expressly asserts that our Lord instituted the Holy Sacrament, not during the Paschal

adds besides, are in great part Directions how they should correct the Abuses brought into the Feast joined to the holy Sacrament, more particularly their scandalous Divisions, which had wholly perverted the true Intention and Design hereof. For the principal End of this Feast was, that the Rich might share their good things with their poor Brethren, and thereby demonstrate\* their Love to them. But the Rich being now taught to separate from the Poor in their Place of Assembly, and to have their own Suppers to themselves, this good Intention was entirely overthrown. It seems to me as if some of them, having been put in mind by St. Paul's Friends, of his Doctrine and Practice when among them, pleaded as an Excuse why they did not stay for their poor Brethren, and admit them to eat with them, as he had always done, that their Appetite was so keen it would not permit them to tarry, and they were forced to take their own Supper before their

*Paschal Supper, but after it;* says, that the *Apostle Paul* thus represents it, and makes use of this as an Argument to prove that he persuades the *Corinthians* entirely, to leave off the attendant Feast, p. 69, 70. On the contrary it is only one part of the Sacrament that is represented by St. Paul and St. Luke, as having been performed after the Paschal Supper. After the same Manner also he took the Cup, WHEN HE HAD SUPPED, 1 Cor. xi. 25. Likewise also the Cup AFTER SUPPER, Luke xxii. 20. The mentioning this so particularly and distinctly, as done after Supper, plainly implies that the other Part was instituted before Supper was ended, or during Supper; and so are we expressly informed it was by the two Evangelists, *Matthew* and *Mark*. And as THEY WERE EATING, *Jesus took Bread and blessed it*, Mat. xvi. 26. And AS THEY DID EAT, *Jesus took Bread, &c.* Mar. xiv. 22. *ἔσθοντες αὐτοὶ τὸν ἄρτον*. See *Grot. on Mat. xvi. 26*.

\* *Cæna nostra de nomine rationem sui ostendit, vocatur enim ἀγάπη id quod dilectio penes Græcos est. Quantifcunque sumptibus constat, lucrum est pietatis nomine facere sumptum; siquidem inopes quoque refrigerio isto juvamus.* *Tertull. Apol. c. 39.*

their Brethren came. This the Apostle tells them might easily be prevented by allaying their Hunger at home before they came to the publick Assembly; and concludes his Exhortation to them upon this Subject with these Words, *Wherefore my Brethren, WHEN YE COME TOGETHER TO EAT, tarry one for another. And if ANY MAN HUNGER let him eat at home, that ye come not together unto Condemnation.* Which Words, I think, as fully imply that they were still to keep up the additional Feast, as any Words can well do. For had the Apostle designed that the Sacrament should be stripp'd of this Feast, could he have described it in such general Terms as their *coming together to eat*, without adding, *this Bread*, and to *drink this Cup*, as in ver. 26, 27, 28? And if we allow this, is it possible he should give the following Direction, *If any Man hunger let him eat at home?* For can it be supposed that any Man should come to the naked Sacrament to satisfy his hunger? In this Case also the Temptation of their not *tarrying one for another* would have been so far removed, as to have made a Direction concerning it the less needful.

I have still to add, that even the Judaizing Teachers and Leaders of the Faction against St. Paul, were so far from considering the Lord's Supper as a *common Meal*, that they esteemed it *spiritual Food*, ascrib'd much more to it than was due, and set a most unreasonable Value upon it, as fully appears from what the Apostle says, in 1 COR. X. 1, 2, 3, &c. *Moreover, Brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our Fathers were under the Cloud, and all passed thorough the Sea, and were all baptized unto Moses in the Cloud and in the Sea: And did all eat THE SAME SPIRITUAL MEAT, and did all drink THE SAME SPIRITUAL*



SPIRITUAL DRINK: (for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ.) But with many of them God was not well pleased; for they were overthrown in the Wilderness. Now these things WERE OUR EXAMPLES, to the Intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted; neither be ye Idolaters as were some of them, as it is written, The People sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play. Neither let us commit Fornication, as some of them committed, and fell in one Day three and twenty Thousand. Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of Serpents. Neither murmur ye, as some of them also murmured, and were destroyed of the destroyer. It's hence, I think evident, that these factious Leaders had taught the Corinthian Christians, that very great was the Virtue of their Baptism, together with the spiritual Meat and Drink they partook of at the Lord's Supper; that they might fully rely on these as every way sufficient to secure to them the Favour of God; that although they went to the Feasts eaten in honour of the Heathen Deities, or committed Fornication, they need be under no Apprehension of hereby incurring the divine Displeasure, for their having been Baptized and their receiving the Lord's Supper, render'd them always acceptable in the Sight of God. Upon which Account the Apostle warns them against trusting to these spiritual Privileges, laying before them the Example of the Jews who perished in the Wilderness. They had been very highly favour'd of God by many miraculous Appearances for their Delive-

\* Thus the Jewish Rabbies taught that no circumcised Person went to Hell, and that if a Man observed any one Precept, it should be well with him. See Dr. Whitby's Notes on Rom. ii. 13. and Jam. ii. 11.

rance, were chosen of God for his peculiar People, and taken into his immediate Protection; a Cloud was formed to be their Guide and Safeguard, and the Sea divided itself to give them a Passage, and they were baptized in the Cloud and in the Sea; they were fed with Bread from Heaven, and drank of a Fountain produc'd by the immediate Power of God, from a Rock, the Waters of which ran down like Rivers, and in a wonderful manner followed them in their Journeyings through the Wilderness; and both of these, that is, the Manna, and the Rock, with the Streams issuing from it, being Types of Christ, they may be said to have eaten the *same spiritual Meat*, and drank the *same spiritual Drink*, that Christians do when they eat and drink the Representatives of Christ's Body and Blood at the holy Sacrament. Notwithstanding these so very great and distinguishing Favours, when they lusted after evil Things, God was displeased with them, and executed his severe Judgments on them. *These Things*, says the Apostle, *were written for our Admonition*, that we may hence learn not to trust to any *spiritual Privileges*; however great they may be, as what will secure to us the Favour of God, if we allow ourselves in Disobedience to his Commands; and are in an especial manner Warnings to us against those particular Sins which prov'd destructive to them, such as *Idolatry, Fornication, tempting of Christ, and murmuring against his Messengers or Apostles*. Which probably are the very Sins that the false and factious Teachers encouraged the *Corinthians* to commit. For as it was they that raised a Murmuring in this Church against St. Paul, so in all likelihood it was they who countenanced the incestuous Person \* and others

\* 1 Cor. v.

In their Uncleanness \* and led the way to Idolatrous Feasts in the Heathen Temples †. Now since these Persons had such a Confidence in the great Efficacy of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as to be persuaded that even *these* Sins could not defile them, nor render them obnoxious to the divine Displeasure; is it not a demonstrative Evidence that they set a most unreasonable Value on them? Is it not as plain as any thing of this nature can be, that they could not *consider* the Lord's Supper as a *common Meal*? Hence then I conclude that your Representation of St. Paul's Sense in this Passage, cannot be the true one. I will not take upon me to ascertain what his Sense is. There's a Variety of Interpretations may be put upon his Words, and probably it's far easier to shew which is not true, than to give a clear Account which is.

The Word *διακείναι* is by many learned Men translated *making a Difference*. In that Case the Sentence is elliptical or defective, and we must know what the Lord's Body is to be distinguished (or as your Word is *differenced*) from. If the Lord's Body here be taken for the Memorial of his Body, then to be sure the thing that it is to be distinguished from, is common Bread. The Sense you have put upon the Words thus translated, I think I have fully prov'd is not true in Fact. If this Translation be admitted, the Meaning may coincide with that of v. 20. *When ye come together into one Place, this is not to eat the*  
G *Lord's*

\* 2 Cor. xii. 21. 1 Cor. vi. 15, 16, 17, 18.

† 1 Cor. viii. 1 Cor. x. 14.—33. The Arguments confuted by the Apostle in these two Chapters, were very probably such as were used by these Factioned Men to persuade the *Corinthians* to this idolatrous Practice. That some near akin to these were used also by the *Jewish* Doctors, See Lightfoot's *Heb. & Talmud. Exercit.* p. 763.

*Lord's Body.* The Meaning here cannot be that they did not come with an Intention to eat the Lord's Supper, but that coming loaded with so many Sins, and especially with Heart-burnings, Jealousies, Envyings, Hatreds, &c. occasion'd by their Divisions, they quite overthrew the Design of this Ordinance, and therefore in effect did not eat the Lord's Supper. In like manner it may be said that they did not *difference* the Representative of Christ's Body from common Bread; not that they were insensible or unmindful that it was the *Memorial* of our Lord's Body, or did not receive it as such; but coming so unprepared, so unfit, so unqualified, it was to them of no better Effect than if they had made no such Difference, it did them no more good than if they had eaten it as *common Bread*. For when Persons make the most solemn Profession to Almighty God of that which is not true, and promise and vow what they never perform, can this have any good Effect? No; but it must certainly have a bad one, and greatly aggravate their Guilt. And in the Case of the *Corinthians* it actually brought the Judgments of Heaven upon them. For this reason, I think, this is by far too faint and languid a Sense to be the true one. For the Apostle adds these Words as the reason why the Judgments of God befell them. *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh DAMNATION TO HIMSELF, not discerning the Lord's Body.* This ought therefore to represent the whole of their Guilt, and to come up to what is said in the 27. v. *being guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord.* The learned *Grotius* makes these Words to signify the same as being guilty of the Murder of Christ, and to be equivalent to what the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* calls



calls crucifying to themselves the Lord of Glory afresh, and treading under Foot the Son of God. If this be the Meaning of the Words in the 27th Verse, Why may not the Ellipsis in the 29th Verse be supplied thus, *not differencing the Lord's Body* from that of a common Malefactor? This indeed may be carrying the Matter too high, and seems to be true only of those who have fallen off from the Christian Faith, are Infidels in their Hearts, and *really* come to the Sacrament with no other thought, than that of eating a Piece of *common Bread*, and drinking of *common Wine*. It would be well however if all such Persons who come to this Ordinance, and at the same time know and feel that they are not determined to part with their Sins, would consider how near their Crime approaches to this. Are they not guilty of a most egregious mocking of Christ, as though he was not acquainted with the Dispositions of their Minds, and Intentions of their Hearts? What is this less than the *Roman* Soldiers did, who blinded our Saviour, and said unto him, Prophesy who is it that smote thee? Do these Persons imagine that they can blind Christ by their lying hypocritical Professions and Vows? Most certainly it highly concerns them to be well apprized what they propose to themselves in receiving.

Other very learned Men translate the Words thus, *not judging aright of the Lord's Body*. Which may be understood in this Sense, *not judging rightly of our Lord's Incarnation and Sufferings*, which were to save us *from* our Sins, but not *in* our Sins. Every one therefore who partakes of the Representatives of the great Christian Sacrifice, with the Expectation that this will secure to him the Favour of God, although he continues in the Practice of Sin, as the factious Leaders among

the *Corinthians* had probably taught them to do, is guilty of a horrid Abuse of Christ's Body and Blood, which were not broken and shed to any such End. Or the Body of Christ may be here put for the Memorial of his Body, and stand for the whole Institution. And in that Sense all Persons who come unqualified to partake of the holy Sacrament, may very properly be said not to judge rightly of the Lord's Body. They have not formed a true Judgment concerning this Institution, and are guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord, *i. e.* of profaning the Memorials of Christ's Body and Blood; as all those who receive, not having truly repented of their Sins, must be said to do. They profess themselves to be what they are not, and take that which they have no Right to; which was the reason of that ancient saying at the Celebration of this Ordinance, *τὰ ἁγία τῶν ἁγίων, i. e. holy Things are only for holy Persons.* And to this well agrees the 29th Article of our Church: "The wicked, and such as be  
 " void of a lively Faith, although they do car-  
 " nally and visibly press with their Teeth (as  
 " St. *Augustin* saith) the Sacrament of the Body  
 " and Blood of Christ: yet in no wise are they  
 " Partakers of Christ, but rather to their Con-  
 " demnation do eat and drink the Sign or Sacra-  
 " ment of so great a Thing.

Having finished those further Remarks on your Book, which I thought at this time proper to write, give me leave to ask you, Whether the same Concern for the Good of Mankind which led you to publish this Book, ought not to prevail with you to set those right who have misapprehended your Meaning? It is an important Subject you have undertaken to inform the World in, and doubtless when you wrote this, you design'd their

Information ; but if they have mistaken your Sense, you have missed your Aim : And the same charitable Inclination should, one would think, induce you to shew them their Error and guide them to your real Sentiments. You seem to have a peculiar Compassion for the superstitious Part of Mankind. If your Defender has interpreted you right, and it be your real Opinion that a Man's retiring to his Closet to meditate on the Death and Passion of Christ in order to prepare for the holy Sacrament is Superstition, let it be made out fully to them that it is such, that for the future they may avoid it. But if this be not your Opinion, ought you not to declare loudly against it? You may say possibly " This " Misrepresentation of my Sentiments being in an " obscure Paper, little read, written by an Author of so low a Rank, that he understands the " Blood of Christ to be *really* (as he expresses " it \*) and not *metaphorically*, the Seal of the " new Covenant, and would not believe me tho' " I had in express Words told him that it was " *called so in a figurative Sense alone*, deserves not " any Notice." But, Sir, this Author is not alone, there is another Writer, or it may be Writers, who have declared the highest Veneration for your Works, and blazon'd your Fame in more Papers than one, that seem fully to have adopted the Defender's Notions concerning your Meaning. I mean the Authors of the *Old Wig*, who, N. 28. recommend to their pretended Country Friend these three *Independent London Journals*, and say, *they know he will be pleased with them; that the Writer in answer to the Remarks has shewn himself a Gentleman and a Man of Sense, and the REMARKER to be scarcely either; and afterwards call him the ingenious Author of the Defence.* What a Value

\* Independent London Journal, N. 5. p. 2. col. 2.

a Value you will set upon the high Applauses they have given your Works, after their Commendations of such a Writer, one may easily guess. It's probable you will think, that their Esteem for this Writer is only a Proof that their Understandings are of a Size with his, that their Paper is little perused, and can do no great harm. Is it not however proper to remedy these things in their Beginning?

Your Defender seems not a little moved that I have not answer'd him, N. 10. But has he advanced a single Proposition, that you can look upon as a just Defence of any thing I have wrote against? I am persuaded you must think he has not. It could serve no Manner of purpose then, and would be a total mis-spence of Time and Paper. Notwithstanding, the further to provoke me to it, he says, I am guilty of *bold Impiety and Presumption*; that I might be *fairly beat into a sly, subtle, undermining Infidel*, N. 6. p. 1. col. 2. that my Book is calculated to inspire the Ignorant with an *antichristian Temper*. N. 6. p. 1. col. 1. that he is willing to believe that my design in writing the Remarks was no worse than to raise a PREJUDICE against the Author of the PLAIN ACCOUNT, N. 6. p. 1. col. 2. that I am suspicious, N. 6. p. 1. col. 1. careless, N. 5. p. 1. col. 3. guilty of scandalous Ignorance, contemptibly ignorant even in the Sense of the Lord's Prayer, N. 6. p. 1. col. 1. 2. Though by the way he does not pretend I have ever once mentioned the Lord's Prayer throughout the Remarks, nor can I conceive that I had the least Occasion to speak of it. Notwithstanding, he roundly avers, I have impiously insinuated that our Saviour has given up an Article of our Faith in this Prayer. His reason is, because there is not one word of the Corruption of our nature insinuated herein. What the insinuating a Word is, I don't



so well understand; but had I asserted that the thing is not plainly intimated in the three first Petitions, I might have been justly esteemed ignorant of the Lord's Prayer. Whence comes it that the Name of God has been unhallow'd, that there has been a general Revolt from his Government, and another Kingdom set up in the World? Whence does it proceed that the Will of God is not so universally done here on Earth as it is in Heaven? For my part I always imputed it to the Fall of Adam, and the Corruption of the human Nature thence ensuing. He represents me as *having no greater Reverence for the daily Service of our Church than for the Lord's Prayer*, N. 6. p. 1. col. 3. fin. asserting, that *there is not to be found in it one Syllable of the original Taint or natural By-asse to Evil*, col. 2. Whereas every one must know that the whole of our Common Prayer is in exact Conformity to the Articles of our Religion. In the Confession we say, *we have followed the Devices and Desires of our own Hearts*. Does not this most evidently suppose that our Hearts are corrupt, and that the Desires and Devices thence proceeding are evil? We further acknowledge that *there is no health in us*. Is it possible to express the general Disorder and Corruption of our Nature in stronger terms? Yet this Author roundly

\* *Article 9.* Original Sin standeth not in the following Adam, (as the *Pelagians* do vainly talk) but it is the Fault and Corruption of the Nature of every Man that naturally is engendred of the Offspring of Adam, whereby Man is very far gone from Original Righteousness, and is of his own Nature inclined to Evil, &c.

*Article 10.* The Condition of Man after the Fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural Strength and good Works, to Faith and calling upon God: Wherefore we have no Power to do good Works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the Grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good Will, and working with us when we have that good Will.

roundly asserts, that *the Confession recites ONLY our Omissions and our actual Sins*, N. 6. p. 1. col. 2. In the Collects for the Day, how many are there make express mention of, or plainly intimate, this Weakness and Disorder of our Nature?

“ O God, the Strength of all them that put  
“ their trust in thee, mercifully accept our  
“ Prayers: and because through the Weakness  
“ of our mortal Nature we can do no good thing  
“ without thee, grant us the help of thy Grace,  
“ that in keeping thy Commandments we may  
“ please thee both in will and deed, through  
“ Jesus Christ our Lord. *1st Sunday after Tri-*  
*nity.*

“ Keep, we beseech thee, O Lord, thy Church  
“ with perpetual Mercy; and because the Frailty  
“ of Man without thee cannot but fall, keep us  
“ ever by thy help from all things hurtful, and  
“ lead us to all things profitable to our Salvation,  
“ through Jesus Christ our Lord. *15th Sunday*  
*after Trinity.*

“ O God, for as much as without thee we are  
“ not able to please thee, mercifully grant that  
“ thy holy Spirit may in all Things direct and  
“ rule our Hearts, through Jesus Christ our  
“ Lord. *19th Sunday after Trinity.*

“ Grant to us, Lord, we beseech thee, the  
“ Spirit to think and do always such Things as be  
“ rightful; that we who cannot do any thing  
“ that is good without thee, may be enabled to  
“ live according to thy Will, through Jesus  
“ Christ our Lord. *9th Sunday after Trinity.\**

And whereas he says, *the Assistance of the divine Spirit is as sparingly requested, as in those Forms of Prayer at the End of your Book*, let any one compare them and judge. You have mentioned the  
Guidance

\* Christmas Sunday, Quinquagesima, First Day in Lent, First Sunday in Lent, Easter-Eve.

Guidance or Concurrence of the holy Spirit three times in Prayers that fill fifty Pages, whereas the Assistance of God's Spirit is requested in express Terms eleven Times in the Collects for the day; all which, if put together, would not make twenty of your Pages. Besides that by the Phrases, *grant us thy Grace, and prevent us by thy Grace*, so frequently used in those Collects, is undoubtedly meant the gracious Assistance of God's holy Spirit. And indeed there is not one Petition for Help in the discharge of our Duty, throughout the whole Common Prayer, but was designed by the Compilers to be understood as what, if obtain'd, we must receive from the sanctifying Influence of the holy Ghost. Nor could I have entertained the least doubt that any of the like Petitions in your Forms \* were intended in any other Sense, had it not been for the many exceptionable Passages in your Book which look another Way, and are taken notice of in the *Remarks*.

This *Author's* Zeal in your Defense is so very great, it transports him quite beyond his Senses, so

\* After having wrote this, I had the Curiosity to read over the Prayers at the end of the *Plain Account*, in order to consider more particularly in what manner the Author has formed his Petitions for the divine Assistance in the Discharge of our Duty, and find them so expressed, that I am fully persuaded he means nothing more by any Petition of this kind, than that God would so order his Providence towards us, as to lead, guide and assist us in the Paths of Virtue, and the Performance of what he requires, by such *external* Advantages, Helps and Methods as shall seem best to him. Nor can I perceive that he has dropp'd one word which necessarily implies any *internal* moving, persuading, influencing or aiding, but on the contrary seems industriously to have avoided it.

The only Petition which can be reckoned of this sort in the first Prayer is, "Guard me by the Dispositions of thy good Providence from all the Ways of Sin, and lead me forward in the Paths of all Virtue, p. 204. The only one in the second is, "Lead us all in the Paths of thy good Providence to everlasting Life and Happiness, p. 206. There being

so that he misconstrues a plain Passage in the *Remarks*, which I am very sure no Child of ten Years old that reads the whole Paragraph with any

none but these which are Petitions for Assistance in the Performance of our Duty in the two first Forms of Prayer, they might probably be design'd as Keys to teach us how to interpret all that are contained in the following Forms, though I think he has sufficiently explain'd himself also in them; as particularly in the third, "I bless thee that by the Dispositions of thy good Providence I have been led to an early and just Sense of Virtue, and of the Importance of true Religion, and that this Sense has been improved by the best Examples and Sentiments of others, and by many peculiar Instances of thy merciful Care and Goodness," p. 209. And the first Petition for Assistance in that Prayer is, "Continue, O Lord, I beseech thee, these thy temporal Favours to me, if thou seest it consistent with my chief and eternal Good; if not, lead me to eternal Life in whatever Paths thou seest fit," p. 210. And the first Petition of this sort in the fourth Prayer is, "Give success, I earnestly beseech thee, by thy gracious Favour and Providence to these Purposes and Designs of my Soul," p. 216. Another Petition in the same Prayer is, "Finally, O Lord, my great and chief Request is, that by the Dispositions of thy good Providence I may obtain everlasting Happiness hereafter," p. 221. In the fifth Prayer, "We bless thy Name for those peculiar Dispositions of thy Providence which have often guarded us from many particular and hazardous Trials and Temptations," p. 247. And the first Petition for Assistance, "We beseech thee so to concur with us by thy merciful Providence and good Spirit, that in the future Conduct of our Lives we may better answer the Ends of our most holy Religion," p. 248. That by adding the Words *good Spirit* to this Petition, he does not mean to ask for any internal Influence of the holy Spirit, I think I have given at least very probable Reasons in the *Remarks*.

The most usual Form in which he puts his Petitions, is beginning with the word *let*. This he is so fond of, or thinks so very just, that he makes use of it 19 times in one Prayer, and 6 times in one Page. "Let the Sense of those peculiar Advantages, which I have by thy special Favour enjoy'd, lead me to such a careful Use and Improvement of them, that they may be the happy Occasions of more than ordinary Degrees of Perfection and Glory hereafter," p. 229. What the peculiar Force of this Expression may be, in his Intention and Use of it, I must leave him to tell; but had he meant



any tolerable Attention, could possibly misunderstand. N. 6. p. 1, col. 2. *fin.* and 3 *pr.* At the End of many of his Paragraphs are Triumphs of Wit. I'll give you one Instance. You had said that *the new Covenant is confirm'd by the Death of Christ, as by a Seal or Testimony to the Truth of it.* In the Remarks I asked, *What is there ascribed here to our Saviour's Death, more than is true with regard to that of St. Stephen or the other Martyrs.* After a String of Questions in answer to this, each of which if form'd into a Syllogism, concludes exactly in the same manner against me, as if he had ask'd, Did St. Stephen and all the Martyrs die at the time of the Jewish Passover, or at the Age of thirty three? he adds, with no small Elation, "Sure the Remarker never considers the Difficulties of his Assertions, or takes any care to obviate them: And his Parallels are just as exactly drawn, as those of a famous Brother, that met in the Center, N. 6. p. 2. col. 1. I have been at

meant hereby, to ask for any *internal* Influence or Assistance, surely he must in some one of those numerous Places in which he uses it, have spoken out plainly. So far is he from doing it, that I think in one of those Petitions he rather intimates that such Assistance is unnecessary. "Let the Consideration of thy merciful Design in making me capable of knowing thee, and being eternally happy in thy Favour, powerfully move me to make such an use of those Faculties thou hast endowed me with, that they may lead me to a due Sense of this Happiness, and conduct me safe to the Possession of those Pleasures which are at thy right Hand," p. 229. If the *internal sanctifying* Influence of the Holy Spirit is not implied in the word *Let*, I am persuaded it's not included in any other word used by him. The Words *lead, direct, guide, bring to mind, promote, dispose, assist*, (the most of which are very rarely used) are easily interpreted of *external* Assistance by the Methods of God's Providence towards us. The word *strengthen* is used but once, and that in interceding for those *who suffer for the Love of Truth, or the Testimony of a good Conscience*, p. 239. and may be understood of God's raising up Friends to encourage, comfort, support and aid them, or by other Dispositions of his Providence leading them to a firm Mind and an undaunted Behaviour.

at the Trouble to put these Things together, to shew you that the *Clamour*, N. 10. p. 2. col. 1. the *violent outcries*, N. 5. p. 1. col. 2. the *railing*, N. 10. p. 2. col. 1. which he so unjustly imputes to me, are indeed on the Side of your Advocate and Admirer.

I shall conclude all with assuring you, that Truth is my Aim; that if I have advanc'd any thing which I cannot defend, I shall most readily give it up; that I have not wilfully misrepresented your Meaning in any one thing; and that if it shall appear to me at any time that I have done it involuntarily, I will as publickly ask your Pardon as I have committed the Offence. I am not at all fond of entering into a Dispute. Nothing but the apprehended Importance of the Subject could have engaged me to write what I have done. And should I be drawn into a Debate on this, or any other Topick, it's my unalterable Resolution to give it over, when I find I am no longer able to manage it with Temper, Candour, and a sincere Regard to Truth. My Heart is witness that I never had a thought of raising any the least Prejudice against your Person, any further than as such Prejudice is necessarily connected with the Representation I have made of the ill Tendency of your Book, which could not possibly be prevented, unless for the same Reason we are never to oppose what is printed, though we apprehend it will be followed with never such mischievous Effects: And I assure you nothing is more true, than that I am

Your Sincere Friend,

And Humble Servant,

London, October 11. 1735.